

REMARKS

This responds to the first Office Action. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-21 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statements

Applicant filed an Information Disclosure Statement on 12/11/2003 (certificate of mailing date) and a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement on 06/02/2004 (certificate of mailing date). Applicant's counsel has not yet received any initialed PTO-1449 forms indicating that the Examiner has considered the documents cited in these Information Disclosure Statements. Applicant's counsel respectfully requests that the Examiner provide such initialed PTO-1449 forms with the next Action.

35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

In response to the Examiner's § 112, first paragraph, rejection, applicant respectfully urges the Examiner to consider FIG. 3 (with the product feed direction moving into the page), wherein it can be seen that the units 7,8 receive respective film lengths 9,10 and form same into a tubular (tunnel-like) structure so that product group 2 can be feed into same. As described at page 7, beginning at line 17, with reference to the film length 9, the film length 9 is wound on the first pair of arms 25 and the second pair of arms 26 by the telescopic arm 21d. In the illustrated example, the second pair of arms 26 then moves away from the first pair to stretch the film 9 into a tunnel-like tube as shown in broken lines (the ends of the film have been joined by the sealing unit 21s). The product group 2 is then able to be fed into the tube (tunnel-like) structure of the film 9, at which time the film is allowed to contract around the package. The package (including the just-described first wrap) is then fed downstream, rotated and wrapped again in a like manner. With these comments in mind, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are fully enabled.

35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The claims have been amended to address the words and phrases deemed by the Examiner to be indefinite and otherwise in an effort to improve clarity. It is respectfully submitted that the claims are now fully definite and withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The applicant and the undersigned respectfully suggest that this application meets all statutory requirements and is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Applicant's counsel is available at the Examiner's convenience by telephone as needed to move this application toward allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'St ~ / h', is written over a horizontal line.

Steven M. Haas (Reg. No. 37,841)
Fay, Sharpe, Fagan, Minnich & McKee, LLP
1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216)861-5582